



Norman H. Bangerter
Governor

Dee C. Hansen
Executive Director

Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D.
Division Director

State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 350
Salt Lake City, Utah 84180-1203
801-538-5340

July 4, 1991

TO: File

FROM: Tony Gallegos, Reclamation Engineer *ag*

RE: Site Inspection, Anderson Supply Company, Anderson Supply Project,
S/049/018, Utah County, Utah

Inspection Date: July 3, 1991
Inspection Time: 8:00 a.m. - 12:00 a.m.
Conditions: Fair, sunny
Participants: J.L. Anderson, Anderson Supply Company; Jerry Mansfield, State Lands & Forestry; Tony Gallegos, DOGM

The operator filed a Notice of Intention to Commence Small Mining Operations (NOI) with the Division on June 21, 1991. The operation was described as a surface clay mine located on State Lands with no structural facilities. The site has old existing disturbances which the current operator claims no responsibility for and which may or may not be pre-law. The operator had requested several variances in the submitted NOI. The purpose of this inspection was to document the current disturbance and evaluate the variance requests.

The site is located east of Lehi near the Provo Reservoir Canal on the lower benches of Mount Timpanogos. It involves a portion of state lands in section 8 and private lands in section 17, both being in Township 5 South, Range 2 East, SLBM. The surface rights of the section 8 portion are privately owned while the State retains the mineral rights. According to Mr. Anderson, this site has been historically mined for clay material for quite some time. He indicated that one of the previous operations at this site was under some configuration of the name of Wadley(sp?). Mr. Anderson was unaware of the need to permit mining operations located on private lands with the Division until the time of this inspection. Subsequently, the portion of the mining operation located on section 17, which is owned by Mr. Anderson, is not referenced in the current NOI.

Page 2
Site Inspection Memo
Anderson Supply Project
S/049/018
July 4, 1991

Several sketches of the site were made and several photographic panoramas were taken from different locations to document the current status of the site. The prominent features are a slumped area immediately above and east-northeast of the pit area, a highwall of approximately 15-25 vertical feet located near the southern boundary of the pit area, and obvious historic mining disturbances which have revegetated naturally. This operation is better described as a cut into the hillside instead of the usual open pit mine.

Mr. Anderson requested variances for items 2,3,4,5,6,7,9, and 11 listed on page three of the SMO-NOI Form. Items 2,3,5, and 6 were requested because this operation does not involve shafts or tunnels, drill holes, toxic materials, or stream channels. Variance from these requirements is not necessary since they do not exist at the site which this memo is meant to document.

Item 4 requires the construction of berms, fences, or barriers above highwalls and excavations. I explained to Mr. Anderson that since his operation does involve a highwall at this time, that one or several of the features in item 4 would need to be implemented. The Division would encourage the immediate construction of a berm, fence or other barrier above the highwall, along with the posting of several warning signs. Since the highwall is located on the private property, these safety measures are especially important with respect to liability to the owner. Mr. Anderson indicated that some no trespassing signs had been posted recently and subsequently vandalized and/or removed. The mine access road off the canal road was blocked with boulders. Mr. Anderson indicated that this area was popular with off-road vehicle users, although this use was not encouraged. With the current configuration of the mine operation, a variance from the requirements of item 4 cannot be granted.

Item 7 requires the disposal of any trash, scrap metal, wood, machinery and buildings. No buildings or structures of any kind are currently at the site, nor any machinery; however, some trash and debris were evident in small amounts. Taking into consideration that some amounts of trash and debris are incidental to most any mining operation and disposal of such objects is reasonable under nearly all post mining land uses, a variance from the requirements of item 7 cannot be granted.

Item 9 requires that all roads that are not part of a permanent transportation system be reclaimed. This must be consistent with the wishes of the land owner for the affected lands. In the case of an operation located on private property, the land owner may request that roads remain upon final reclamation. At this particular site, the main access is from a graded dirt road which runs parallel to the

Page 3
Site Inspection Memo
Anderson Supply Project
S/049/018
July 4, 1991

canal. Several spur roads access the mine site from this canal road. Another graded dirt road which parallels a pipeline exists above and to the east of the mine site.

I explained to Mr. Anderson that usually any road which does not provide access to some feature other than the mine site would be considered as needing to be reclaimed upon final reclamation. This includes roads within the mine area itself. Mr. Anderson indicated that he would like the short spur roads coming off the canal road to remain after mining operations cease. A variance allowing these roads to remain will not be granted unless the operator can demonstrate that these roads provide necessary access to some feature other than the minesite. The road(s) which exist on the land not owned by Mr. Anderson are not included in this variance request. A written statement expressing the desire for roads to remain from the documented owner of the surface rights in this area (section 8) must be provided to the Division before a variance may be granted here.

Item 11 refers to the stabilization of highwalls by backfilling or rounding to 45 degrees or less, to the reshaping of the land to near its original contour, and to the redistribution of topsoil and suitable overburden. I indicated to Mr. Anderson that the Division would require stabilization of any highwall and general regrading of any surface features which would remain after operations cease. The Division would also require the redistribution of any topsoil or other overburden material over the disturbed areas upon final reclamation of the site. Consequently the Division will not grant a variance for Item 11.

Mr. Anderson indicated that no topsoil had been salvaged prior to this date. The overburden material was most likely separated from the clays and subsequently used or discarded onsite. Mr. Anderson agreed to salvage and stockpile topsoil materials in any future expansions of the mining area. With an estimated annual production of several hundred tons, the mine area will not be expanding outside its current borders for several years. Mr. Anderson indicated that portions of the historic mining areas may contain suitable borrow material for topsoil use. This is an option, although these areas have revegetated naturally and disturbing them further may not be advantageous.

The mine area which has been disturbed by the current operator is approximately 250 ft by 120 ft square (as measured with a hip chain) or 0.7 acre. This does not include the roads which lead to the site from the canal road. Including these roads with the mine site would give a total disturbed area of approximately 1.5 - 2 acres.

Page 4
Site Inspection Memo
Anderson Supply Project
S/049/018
July 4, 1991

The inspection concluded with the understanding that the Division would inform Mr. Anderson of the results of the inspection and decisions with respect to the variance requests.

jb
cc: J.L. Anderson, Anderson Supply Company
Jerry Mansfield, State Lands & Forestry
Minerals File
S049018.1